

Applicants: Shoji Miyazaki et al.
Appl. No.: 10/809,240
Filed: March 25, 2004
page 8 of 15

REMARKS

Claims 45-65 were pending in the subject application. By this Amendment, Claim 46 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Claims 45 and 47 have been amended. Applicants maintain that the amendments do not raise an issue of new matter. Support for amendments to Claims 45 and 47 can be found in the application at least on page 59, line 4 - page 60, line 18, and page 63, line 5 - page 64, line 5, and Figures 9 and 10. Accordingly, entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Obviousness-type Double Patenting Rejections based on U.S. Patent 6,875,327

Claims 45-47 and 49 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claim 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 48 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 13 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 51 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 3, 13 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 52 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 4 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 53 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 5 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 54 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 6 and 14 of U.S. Patent No.

420318.1

Applicants: Shoji Miyazaki et al.
Appl. No.: 10/809,240
Filed: March 25, 2004
page 9 of 15

6,875,327.

Claim 55 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 7 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 56 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 8 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 57 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 9 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 58 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 10 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 59 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 11 and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 60 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 10, 12, 14 and 15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 61 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 10, 12 and 14-16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 62 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 14 and 18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 63 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double

420318.1

Applicants: Shoji Miyazaki et al.
Appl. No.: 10/809,240
Filed: March 25, 2004
page 10 of 15

patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 14 and 19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 64 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 14 and 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Claim 65 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 14 and 21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327.

Applicants attach hereto a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321(c) in order to remove the double patenting rejections over U.S. Patent No. 6,875,327. The fee for submitting a Terminal Disclaimer is \$140.00, and a check including this amount is enclosed. In view of the Terminal Disclaimer attached hereto, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these double patenting rejections.

Obviousness-type Double Patenting Rejections based on co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/809,217

Claims 45-47 and 58 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claim 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/809,217.

Claim 48 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 57 and 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 49 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 47 and 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 50 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

420318.1

Applicants: Shoji Miyazaki et al.
Appl. No.: 10/809,240
Filed: March 25, 2004
page 11 of 15

double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 48 and 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 51 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 49 and 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 52 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 50 and 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 53 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 47, 51 and 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 54 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 47, 52 and 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 55 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 53 and 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 56 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 54 and 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 57 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 55 and 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 59 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 46 and 59 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

420318.1

Applicants: Shoji Miyazaki et al.
Appl. No.: 10/809,240
Filed: March 25, 2004
page 12 of 15

Claim 60 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 59 and 60 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 61 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 59 and 61 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 62 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 59 and 62 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 63 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 59 and 63 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 64 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 59 and 64 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Claim 65 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over Claims 59 and 65 of co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217.

Applicants attach hereto a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.321(c) in order to remove the double patenting rejections over co-pending U.S. Patent Application 10/809,217. The fee for submitting a Terminal Disclaimer is \$140.00, and a check including this amount is enclosed. In view of the Terminal Disclaimer attached hereto, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these double patenting rejections.

420318.1